DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 439 CS 011 339

AUTHOR Lore, Rosemary; Chamberlain, Edward
TITLE Language Development Component Chapter 1 Reading Program 1991-92. Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 8 Jul 93
NOTE 55p.; For 1990-91 report, see ED 343 110.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Early Intervention; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *Instructional Effectiveness; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; Program Effectiveness; Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Middle School Students; Outcome Based Education

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the effectiveness of the Chapter 1 Reading Program, which provided assistance to 5,527 selected underachieving pupils in grades one through eight in the Columbus, Ohio public schools. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs for the improvement of language and reading skills. Data included results of norm-referenced tests administered in a spring-to-spring cycle. Results indicated that: (1) of the 2,100 grade 2-8 pupils in an evaluation sample, 59.4% gained 3.0 or more NCE points on the reading comprehension score; (2) total reading scores for a sample of 2,082 pupils in grades 2-8 increased an average of 5.6 NCE points; (3) of 27 first-grade pupils in a treatment group, 15 pupils (55.6%) successfully completed reading level 8, appropriate for promotion to grade 2; (4) of 2,243 pupils, 93.8% were promoted to the next grade or passed their target reading courses; and (5) parents of 94.9% of 2,308 pupils participated in involvement activities. Findings suggest the program should be continued; reasons for the small sample size should be determined and ameliorated if possible; the strong support system should continue; planning should take place at the building level; and use of the term "discontinued" should be clarified. (Ten tables of data are included; two tables of data and evaluation instruments are attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358439

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM

1991-92

Written by:

Rosemary Lore and Edward Chamberlain
Professional Specialists

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Data Analysis by:

Kathy L. Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

CS011337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

P:\PS02\FRPTRD92
7-8-93 12:51 PM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Thompson, Ph.D

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM
1991-92

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The Chapter 1 Reading Program served 5527 pupils. Funding of the component was made available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Chapter 1 of Title I of 1965, reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendment of 1988.

The purpose of the Chapter 1 Reading Program was to provide assistance to selected underachieving pupils in grades one through eight in order that they might attain more fully their potential for and improvement of language and reading skills. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs, as determined by continued cooperation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Inservice sessions were provided for various subgroups of program teachers.

The program provided service to 85 public elementary schools, 26 public middle schools, and eleven nonpublic schools. One additional full-time teacher, who served two schools, was funded by the school system's general fund, but Chapter 1 guidelines were followed in all teaching units. Because public school program teachers were funded 90% by Chapter 1 funds and 10% by the school district's general fund, they were called Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers. Several different service patterns were devised in order to schedule Chapter 1 instruction for 90% of the teacher's time. Program teachers in the nonpublic schools served as full-time Chapter 1 teachers.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the program started on September 16, 1991, for all grades except grade 1 which began September 23, 1991. For evaluation based on standardized test data the time interval ended April 3, 1992. This provided a maximum of 122 possible days of instruction for grade 1, or 127 days for grades 2-8. An additional 14 school days (through May 1, 1992) were included in the time interval for evaluating Desired Outcomes not based on standardized test data. Each Desired Outcome had a pupil attendance criterion of attending 80% of scheduled program days for inclusion in the sample or treatment group.

Activities: Program teachers provided small group instruction to strengthen reading skills. Consultation with classroom teachers and parents was emphasized in order to provide for individual pupil needs.

Desired Outcomes: Desired Outcome 1(a) stated that at least 50% of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample--those who met the attendance criterion or were discontinued, were English-speaking, and had a valid pretest-posttest score for Reading Comprehension (advanced)--would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period. Desired Outcome 1(b) stated that at least 50% of pupils in grade 1 who met the treatment group attendance criterion or were discontinued would reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. Desired Outcome 2 stated that at least 75% of pupils who met the treatment group attendance criterion would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their regular reading courses (grades 6-8). Desired Outcome 3 stated that parents of at least 75% of pupils who met the treatment group attendance criterion would participate in one or more specified parent involvement activities during the 1991-92 school year.

Evaluation Design: The Evaluation Design included the Desired Outcomes stated above and the instruments used to measure them. Desired Outcome 1(a) was evaluated through the administration of norm-referenced tests in a spring-to-spring testing cycle. The Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6), was used for grade 2. Grades 3-8 received the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills

(CTBS, 1981) in the spring of 1991 and the California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985) in the spring of 1992. All CTBS scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher. Analyses of the pretest to posttest data were primarily in terms of NCE change scores and percentages of pupils by grade meeting criterion for the NCE point gain of 3.0. Desired Outcome 1(b) was evaluated by a locally constructed criterion-referenced oral reading test. Desired Outcomes 2 and 3 were evaluated by means of locally constructed instruments and/or the district computer files.

Major Findings: The information collected on the Pupil Data Sheets indicated the program served 5527 public and nonpublic pupils for an average of 3.3 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 4323.8 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 102.3 days and the average attendance per pupils was 86.2 days.

Desired Outcome 1(a), that at least 50% of pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample gain 3.0 or more NCE points on the Reading Comprehension score (advanced skills), was attained. Of the 2100 pupils in the sample, 59.4% (1248 pupils) made the requisite gain. The average gain for Reading Comprehension across grades was 6.8 NCE points. At the individual grade level, all grades except grades 4 and 6 met the criterion.

Additional analyses of aggregate achievement scores for Total Reading (basic skills) for grades 2-8 showed that in a sample of 2082 pupils the average gain score across grades was 5.6 NCE points. At the individual grade level, all grades achieved a positive change in NCE points. Positive changes ranged from 1.3 NCEs in grade 6 to 9.0 in grade 8.

Desired Outcome 1(b), that at least 50% of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2, was attained. Of the 27 first-grade pupils in the treatment group, 15 pupils (55.6%) successfully completed level 8.

Desired Outcome 2 was that at least 75% of pupils meeting the treatment group attendance criterion would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their regular reading courses (grades 6-8). This Desired Outcome was met at every grade level. Of the 2243 pupils in this treatment group 93.8% (2105 pupils) were promoted or passed their target courses.

Desired Outcome 3 stated that parents of at least 75% of treatment group pupils would participate in one or more specified parent involvement activities. This Desired Outcome was met at every grade level, with parents of 94.9% (2190) of the 2308 pupils in this treatment group participating in the desired activities.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor the record-keeping procedures of teachers. Telephone conferences, on-site visitation, and inspections of records were instrumental in assuring accuracy.

Recommendations: The following recommendations were made: (1) The program should be continued; (2) Since only 2100 pupils of the 5477 program pupils served in grades 2-8 were included in the evaluation sample for Desired Outcome 1(a), reasons for the small sample size should be determined, and ameliorated if possible; (3) continue the strong support system provided by program administrators and coordinators; (4) plan at the building level to insure time for joint planning between program and classroom teachers; and (5) clarify to all program teachers the specialized term "Discontinued" (pupils moved from program because they no longer need it).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
CHAPTER 1 READING PROGRAM

1991-92

The Chapter 1 Reading Program served 5527 pupils. Funding of the component was made available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1 of Title I of 1965, reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988.

The primary goal of the Chapter 1 Reading program was to help students to become successful readers and learners in their regular classrooms (Competency Based Education handout, 1992). This was to be accomplished by program teachers who were to provide supplementary instruction. This supplementary instruction was to reinforce the reading and writing activities of the classroom and to focus on the individual needs of pupils identified for service.

Each teacher's program was to be structured to that a visitor should observe the following facets: (1) a literate environment which supported pupils learning; (2) the use of support materials which revealed a well-organized and focused instructional program; (3) a well-organized and focused instructional program which incorporated reading and writing of whole text, rereading of familiar text, and other instructional activities to meet individual needs; (4) a positive and purposeful classroom climate; and (5) evidence that the teacher followed Chapter 1 guidelines.

The facet, "Following Chapter 1 Guidelines", was broken into two major parts: management of classroom instruction (maintaining the school system's regular instructional schedule, documenting coordination with classroom teacher, adhering to a multifactor selection process) and management of parent involvement activities (informing parents when child started receiving services, establishing a regular parent involvement schedule, sending pupil progress reports, verifying that parents were aware of specific instructional objectives and were welcome to observe a Chapter 1 classroom, and that a minimum number of conferences were scheduled).

The Chapter 1 Reading Program was staffed by 162 (unduplicated count) public and nonpublic teachers serving in 170 program units in 122 schools. One general fund teacher and her two schools were included in this census. Of the 122 schools with program units, 111 were in public schools and 11 were in Chapter 1 eligible nonpublic schools. Of the 111 public schools, 85 were elementary and 26 were middle. The Nonpublic Project served grades 1-8.

Of the 162 teachers in the total program, 108 were public elementary school teachers (including the one general fund teacher), 46 were public middle school teachers, and 8 were nonpublic school teachers. Since some teachers were assigned to two schools, the 162 teachers taught in a total of 170 program units. Of these, 112 units were in public elementary schools (including two general fund program units), 47 units were in public middle schools, and 11 program units were in the Nonpublic Project schools (grades 1-8).

Thirty-seven (an unduplicated count) of the 162 Chapter 1 Reading Program teachers were combination teachers i.e., Combos. For this report, to be considered a Combo teacher, the teacher had to be assigned both reading and mathematics at the same school. For definition purposes, teaching mathematics at one school and reading at another site made the teacher a half-time reading or a half-time

mathematics teacher--not a Combo. Combos served in both the reading program and in the mathematics program at the same school. Evaluation of the mathematics program is reported separately (Gibbons, 1992)

Public school program teachers (both elementary and middle school) were funded 90 percent by Chapter 1 funds and 10 percent by the district's general fund. They were called Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers.

According to Federal and State Program guidelines for implementing the Chapter 1 Reading Program, the public elementary and middle school, full-time Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers were to provide instruction to a maximum of 36 pupils (half-time teachers 18 pupils) during the day, nine times during a two-week cycle, for a minimum of 40-60 minutes per day. This was the prevailing pattern of service; however, other patterns were in evidence (Patterns of Service Delivery are discussed later in this report beginning on page 3). Instruction took place in regular classrooms or in rooms equipped as language laboratories. One full-time general-fund teacher was assigned two schools in this project. The two general fund program units represented an expansion of the Chapter 1 program. All Chapter 1 guidelines for these two program units were in effect. The data for this teacher's units were subsumed in the elementary school data for this report.

The Chapter 1 Nonpublic Project teachers (elementary and middle school) were funded 100 per cent by Chapter 1 funds and provided instruction individually, or in groups of four, to pupils two-to-five times per week, for 45 minute periods. They provided service off church property in mobile classroom units. Because Nonpublic Project teachers were Columbus school employees and were part of the Chapter 1 Reading Program, they followed ESEA Chapter 1 guidelines.[1]

The Chapter 1 Reading Program served a total of 5527 pupils. Of the 5527 total, 3620 pupils (grades 2-5) were served in the elementary public school projects and 1692 pupils were served in the public middle school project. The Nonpublic Project schools served 215 pupils in grades 1-8.

A further breakdown of the pupil census showed that at the primary level (grades 1-3), a total of 2543 public and nonpublic school pupils received service. At the intermediate level (grades 4-5), a total of 1236 public and nonpublic school pupils received service; and at the middle school level, (grades 6-8) a total of 1748 public and nonpublic school pupils were served.

Evaluation Design

Desired Outcomes

Three Desired Outcomes (performance objectives) to be achieved by program pupils[1] were delineated for the Chapter 1 Reading Program as follows:

Desired Outcome 1(a): At least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample (those pupils who had valid pretest and posttest measures, were English-speaking, and attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued) will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test.

Norm-referenced test data for Reading Comprehension performance are reported for the grade 2-8 sample as required in Desired Outcome 1(a). In addition, Federal Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading for individual buildings. To fulfill this requirement, Total Reading test data are also reported in the findings section of this report for grades 2-8.

Desired Outcome 1(b): At least 50 percent of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group (those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued) will reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. The appropriate Scott Foresman text reading level for the end of grade 1 is successful completion of reading level 8 (3rd preprimer).

Desired Outcome 2: Annually at least 75 percent of the pupils grades (1-8) in the treatment group (those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued) will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level at the elementary level or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs at the middle school level. At the middle school level only pupils who are enrolled in a reading course will be included.

Desired Outcome 3: Parents of at least 75 percent of Chapter 1 pupils (grades 1-8) in the treatment group (those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued) will participate by visiting the classroom, volunteering in the classroom, assisting with homework, reading to or being read to by their children, or attending parent-teacher conferences during the 1991-92 school year. Records of parent contacts and activities will be maintained by Chapter 1 teachers.

Program Timelines and Patterns of Service Delivery

Because all three Desired Outcomes defined the evaluation sample or the treatment group in terms of pupils who satisfied attendance requirements for the instructional period, the reader should be aware of the program timelines and the program teacher Patterns of Service Delivery in the Chapter 1 Reading Program.

The program time period for Desired Outcome 1(a) for evaluation purposes was 127 days maximum beginning September 16, 1991, and ending April 3, 1992, for all grades and all projects except grade 1 in the Chapter 1 Nonpublic Projects. For grade 1, the evaluation time period was 122 days and began September 23, 1991, and ended April 3, 1992. Analyses of pretest-posttest performance was contingent upon the pupil meeting the attendance criterion for inclusion in the evaluation sample for this outcome.

For pupils in grades 2-8, the program time period established for evaluating Desired Outcomes 1(b), 2, and 3 was 141 days maximum beginning September 16, 1991 and ending May 1, 1992. For grade 1 pupils, the estimated time period was 136 days maximum beginning September 23, 1991 and ending May 1, 1992. Analyses of these three outcomes were contingent upon pupils' meeting the attendance criterion delineated by the specific Desired Outcome.

The program timelines were in effect for all pupils except for those who were discontinued. To discontinue a pupil, the program teacher had to follow criteria set forth by Federal and State Programs. Any child discontinued following due process was automatically included in both treatment groups (regardless of their attendance).

However, there were some variations in the maximum number of program days (amounting to a day or two more or less) for the nonpublic schools. This difference occurred when their schedules differed from the Columbus Public School scheduled vacation days, inservice days, parent conference days, and professional days.

Public school Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers were funded 90 percent from Chapter 1 funds and 10 percent from the district's General Fund. Nonpublic school teachers were funded 100 percent from Chapter 1 funds. General Fund time was not used for Chapter 1 pupils. Because of this, the maximum number of scheduled days (enrollment) for pupils was dependent upon each teacher's Pattern of Service Delivery. Even though the program guidelines defined the program time period giving the maximum number of

possible days, each teacher's pattern of service dictated how many days would be counted as scheduled days for pupils in that unit.

At least four patterns of service delivery were in effect. The general operating rule for public school program teachers was for them to schedule 90% of the pupil week or day for compensatory instruction. This was accomplished in several ways:

- Of the 170 program units, 64.1% (109 units) had pupils scheduled 90% of each cycle of two weeks for compensatory instruction, giving a 9 out of 10 day service pattern for each pupil.
- Of the 170 program units, 31.8% (54 units) had pupils scheduled 90% of each day for compensatory instruction, giving a 5-day service pattern for each pupil.
- Seven program units, (4.1%) had pupils scheduled in other patterns of service.

This created some complications during data analyses because inclusion in the evaluation sample or treatment group of any desired outcome was tied to an attendance criterion of pupil attendance for 80 percent of the scheduled days of instruction. Data analyses incorporated these mixed patterns so that pupils were not kept out of the treatment group or the evaluation sample.

Instruments

The evaluation design required the collection of data in five areas of operation for the overall program: Pupil Census, Standardized Achievement Testing, Retainee/Course Failure, Text Reading Level, and Parent Involvement. Though not required for the evaluation design, data from selected inservice meetings and process evaluation were collected, analyzed, and reported to Federal and State Programs. Specific instruments are discussed below. Copies of instruments used to collect the data are found in Appendix B, with the exception of the standardized achievement tests.

1. Pupil Census Instruments

   Calendar Worksheet for Recording Days of Pupil Attendance. The Calendar Worksheet was developed to help program teachers collect program service data. A Calendar Worksheet was kept for each pupil. The form included the following information: the pupil's name, birthdate, number, ethnic or race code, sex, grade level, and the selection Service Index Number. These forms were kept up-to-date by the program teachers so that correct information was available to report at the end of the year on the Pupil Data Sheet. These forms were examined periodically for process evaluation. See page 29 of Appendix B for copy of form.

   Pupil Roster 1991-92. In February 1992, a computer-generated roster of pupils sorted by program, school, teacher's social security number, and student name within grade was sent to program teachers. They checked all names of pupils enrolled and served during the 1991-92 school year. If teachers taught in two or more compensatory programs, they completed a roster for each program (see page 30, Appendix B for a sample copy).

   Pupil Data Sheet. The Pupil Data Sheet was developed to help program teachers summarize the pupil information from the Calendar Worksheets and parent information from the Parent Involvement Log. This instrument was used to collect the following information: identification of pupils who were English-speaking; subjective ratings of pupil progress given by teachers; the number of hours of instruction per week; identification of pupils who were discontinued; data on whether a parent helped with homework or read to child or vice versa; an enumeration of five parent involvement activities; and lastly, the number of days of service received. A copy of the instrument can be found on page 31 of Appendix B.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Instruments

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981). Except at grades 1 and 2, program pupils were administered the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981) in the spring of 1991 as a pretest. This test series, which is published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established October 6-10, 1980, and April 27 to May 1, 1981.

California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985). The California Achievement Tests were administered to program pupils in grades 3-8 in Spring 1992 as a posttest. This test series, which is also published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established in the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). Second-grade pupils were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth edition (MAT6, 1985), which is published by the Psychological Corporation/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. This test series has two sets of norms (national and nonpublic) for fall and spring. Standardization was established between October 1 and 31 in 1984 for fall, and spring standardization was established between April 8 and May 15 in 1985.

All testing was done on level using the Norm-Referenced Model for evaluation of the Chapter 1 Reading Program. A spring-to-spring testing cycle was used for grades 2-8. The form, subtest, and test levels used for each grade level are shown in Table 1. All CTBS pretest scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher.

The achievement tests were administered as follows: Pretests and posttests for grades 2-8 were administered as part of Districtwide Testing in Spring 1991 and Spring 1992. Program teachers in ten of the eleven (see Footnote 1) nonpublic schools (grades 2-8) administered their own pretests and posttests. During Districtwide Testing, tests were administered by classroom teachers with program teachers serving as proctors.

3. Retainee/Course Failure and Text Reading Level Instruments

District Retention File and District Grade Reporting File. At the end of the year, information regarding retention was obtained from the district retention file for public school elementary pupils in grades 2-5. The course failure information for middle school pupils was obtained from the district grade reporting file for public school pupils in grades 6-8. This information was needed to determine the percentage of pupils meeting the criterion of Desired Outcome 2.

Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form. A locally developed instrument, Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form, was designed to collect the Nonpublic Project (grades 1-8) retention/course failure and text reading level data. This printout was a roster of pupil names with spaces for marking whether or not an elementary pupil was retained and/or for recording the final grade received by a middle school pupils in reading. On the collection form was also a space for recording Text Reading Level information which was needed for Desired Outcome 1(b) for grade 1 pupils. Both the retainee/course failure information and the text reading level information for nonpublic schools were collected by program teachers and reported (via telephone) to the Department of Program Evaluation. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix B, page 32.

Table 1

Table of Standardized Achievement Measures
for Chapter 1 Reading Program
1991-92

Program Component	Grade	Pretest				Posttest			
		Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)	Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)
		Spring 1991				Spring 1992			
Elementary School Reading (Grades 2-5)	2	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading
	3	CTBS	D	V	Total Reading	CAT	13	E	Total Reading
	4	CTBS	E	V	Total Reading	CAT	14	E	Total Reading
	5	CTBS	F	V	Total Reading	CAT	15	E	Total Reading
Middle School Reading (Grades 6-8)	6	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading	CAT	16	E	Total Reading
	7	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading	CAT	17	E	Total Reading
	8	CTBS	H	V	Total Reading	CAT	18	E	Total Reading

Note. The MAT6 Total Reading score includes the Vocabulary, Word Recognition, and Reading Comprehension Subtests. The CTBS and the CAT Total Reading Scores include the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests.

P:\P502\FCT92TBL
7.8.93

4. Parent Involvement Instrument

Parent Involvement Log. The Parent Involvement Log was a locally developed instrument designed to assist teachers in keeping a record of the number of parent contacts and teacher hours spent in these contacts. Teachers were asked to collect data for two activities which could occur anytime during the year: whether the parent helped the child with homework and whether the parent read to the child or the child read to the parent. Teachers were also asked to record how many parents were involved and how much time the teacher gave to the following five activities: involvement in planning, attendance at group meetings, individual conferences, parental classroom visits, and home visits (see page 33, Appendix B).

Pupil Data Sheet. This instrument, described earlier, was used by teachers to help summarize data from their Parent Involvement Logs. A copy can be found in Appendix B, page 31.

As stated at the beginning of the Instruments section of this report, data for selected inservice meetings and process evaluation were collected, although not required by the evaluation design. A locally developed instrument, General Inservice Evaluation Form (see page 34, Appendix B), was designed to obtain teacher perceptions regarding selected inservice sessions. The form was administered to participants at the close of each inservice session. A modified version of the general form was used for the orientation meetings (see pages 35-36, Appendix B). While the design did not provide for the collection of these data (nor are the findings reported here), interim inservice evaluation reports were forwarded to Federal and State Programs, where they are available on request. Dates and topics of the evaluated inservice meetings are shown in Table 2.

A discussion of the results from process evaluation, which was conducted periodically throughout the year, appears later in this report.

Major Findings

The Chapter 1 Reading Program was structured to serve elementary (grades 2-5) and middle school pupils (grades 6-8) in the public schools and grades 1-8 in the nonpublic schools. The Nonpublic Project (NP) and the public school project achievement data were generally aggregated as a single entity for reporting purposes in the results section of this report. The same Desired Outcomes were expected from both public and nonpublic projects. An overview of evaluation results for the three Desired Outcomes is provided in Tables 9 and 10 on pages 20-21.

Pupil Census Information

A total of 5527 pupils, including 5312 pupils in public schools (grades 2-8) and 215 in nonpublic schools (grades 1-8), was served by the ESEA Chapter 1 Reading Program during the 1991-92 school year for an average of 3.3 hours of instruction per week. Of the 5527 pupils, 3779 were in grades 1 through 5 and 1748 attended middle schools. Generally, the 215 nonpublic elementary and middle school pupils' enrollment and attendance data were subsumed in the public school data.

The average daily membership in the overall program was 4323.8 pupils. The average days scheduled (enrollment) per pupil was 102.3 days, and the average days served (attendance) per pupil was 86.2 days. Data pertaining to enrollment and attendance are presented in Table 3.

Pupil census information also included teachers' subjective ratings of pupil progress as pupils exited the program. Of the 5527 pupils served in the program 1637 (29.6%) were rated by their program teachers as making much progress, 3359 (60.8%) as making some progress, and 531 (9.6%) as making no progress.

Table 2

Dates and Topics of Evaluated Inservice Meetings Conducted
for Public and Nonpublic Teachers in the
Chapter 1 Reading Program
1991-92

Date	Title of Inservice	Elementary (Grades 2-5)	Middle (Grades 6-8)	Nonpublic (Grades 1-8)
August 29 and August 30, 1991	Orientation for Elementary Reading Consulting Teachers	X		
August 30, 1991	Orientation for Nonpublic Program Reading Teachers			X
September 3, 1991	Orientation for Middle School Consulting Teachers		X	
September 25, 1991	Interactive Writing for Nonpublic Program Grade 1 Reading Teachers			X
March 5, 1992	Responses to Literature			X
May 21, 1992	End-of-Year Wrap-up Session for Nonpublic Program Teachers			X
Total		1	1	4

Table 3

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Served; Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served, Daily Membership, and Hours of Instruction Per Week Reported by Grade Level for Chapter 1 Reading Programs
1991-92

Grade	N	Girls	Boys	Average			
				Days Scheduled[a]	Days Served[b]	Daily Membership[c]	Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
1	50	18	32	89.4	79.0	39.4	2.9
2	1461	654	807	96.6	84.3	1110.5	3.3
3	1032	441	591	101.2	88.9	821.3	3.3
4	660	300	360	100.9	86.3	525.6	3.3
5	576	275	301	98.3	83.5	450.2	3.3
6	827	384	443	112.0	90.8	662.7	3.5
7	582	270	312	112.7	87.7	470.2	3.5
8	339	157	182	100.5	77.9	244.0	3.4
Total	5527	2499	3028	102.3	86.2	4323.8	3.3

[a]Days scheduled included days the pupils were scheduled and NOT served as well as days pupils WERE served. Scheduled days for grade 1 began September 23, 1991 and for grades 2-8 September 16, 1991. Scheduled days ended for all projects on May 1, 1992.

[b]Days served were days pupils actually received instruction.

[c]Average Daily Membership was dependent on the Pattern of Service Delivery used by individual teachers.

Standardized Achievement Test Information

Program pupils were included in either or both of two evaluation samples. One was comprised of pupils who met the attendance criteria or were discontinued, were English speaking, and had a valid Reading Comprehension pretest and posttest score. The second was comprised of pupils who met the attendance criteria or were discontinued, were English-speaking, and had a valid Total Reading pretest and posttest score. Some pupils might have met the criteria for only one evaluation sample. Norm-referenced test data for Reading Comprehension are reported for grades 2-8 as required in Desired Outcome 1(a). However, federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) and Total Reading (Basic Skills) for individual buildings. Therefore, Total Reading test data for grades 2-8 are also reported.

Of the 5477 pupils served, 36 (0.7%) were non-English speaking. An additional 3341 were excluded from the Reading Comprehension analysis due to incomplete test data and/or non-attainment of the attendance criterion. The final evaluation sample for the Reading Comprehension analysis was comprised of the remaining 2100 pupils, which was 38.3% of the 5477 pupils served. The final evaluation sample for the Total Reading analysis was 2082 pupils, or 38.0% of the 5477 pupils served. Excluded from the evaluation sample for Total Reading were the 36 non-English speaking pupils as well as an additional 3359 pupils who had not attained the attendance criterion and/or had incomplete test data.

Normal curve equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. In the following narrative the Reading Comprehension (Advanced) test results from the grade 2-8 evaluation sample used to measure Desired Outcome 1(a) attainment are discussed first; and following that discussion, the Total Reading (Basic) test results from the grade 2-8 evaluation sample used in aggregated data to fulfill Federal Guideline requirements are discussed.

Desired Outcome 1(a) Information

Desired Outcome 1(a) stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in reading comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. The following section discusses the results of norm-referenced testing for Reading Comprehension for grades 2-8.

Evaluation of reading comprehension performance. The grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension showed a total of 2100 public and nonpublic school pupils. Of the 1528 pupils in the elementary (grades 2-5 sample), 1078 were in the primary groups and 450 were in the intermediate group. The middle school sample had a total of 572 pupils.

Data for normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for the 2100 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension are presented in Table 4. To meet the desired outcome for advanced skills, at least 50% of the pupils had to gain at least 3.0 NCE points between pretest and posttest. Of the 2100 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample, 1248 pupils, or 59.4% met this criterion change score. Thus Desired Outcome 1(a) was met for the overall program. The overall average gain for the program was 6.8 NCEs. Individual grades meeting the desired outcome were grade 2 (69.9%, average NCE 11.3), grade 8 (67.4%, average NCE 11.1), grade 3 (64.9%, average NCE 8.9), grade 5 (58.5%, average NCE 6.6) and grade 7 (64.5%, average NCE 5.2). The desired outcome was not met in grade 4 (39.1, average NCE -0.5) or grade 6 (41.7%, average NCE 0.2).

It should be kept in mind that NCEs are based on percentiles which compare the pupil's performance in relation to the general population. For a pupil's NCE score to remain the same at posttest as at pretest does not denote a lack of absolute progress; on the contrary, it means that the pupil has maintained the

Table 4

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) and Percent of Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a] for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Reading Comprehension Performance Reported by Grade Level 1991-92

Grade	Sample	Pretest				Posttest				NCE Change		
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Overall Average Change	Pupils Meeting Performance Criterion[a]	
											N	%
2	591	1.0	81.1	24.5	14.8	1.0	99.0	35.8	16.0	11.3	413	69.9
3	487	3.0	61.0	26.3	12.1	1.0	79.0	35.2	13.6	8.9	316	64.9
4	243	1.0	74.0	31.8	12.8	3.0	61.0	31.4	12.6	-0.5	95	39.1
5	207	4.0	56.0	27.3	12.2	9.0	86.0	33.9	12.0	6.6	121	58.5
6	300	6.0	48.0	28.6	9.7	1.0	59.0	28.8	12.1	0.2	125	41.7
7	183	1.0	39.0	26.7	8.1	6.0	77.0	31.9	10.6	5.2	118	64.5
8	89	6.0	41.0	16.7	10.8	1.0	52.0	27.8	11.3	11.1	60	67.4
Total	2100	1.0	81.1	26.5	12.7	1.0	99.0	33.3	13.8	6.8	1248	59.4[b]

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 in Spring 1991 and Spring 1992. Grades 3-8 received the CTBS in Spring 1991 and the CAT in Spring 1992. CTBS scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher.

[a]Criterion: At least 50% of pupils in the evaluation sample to make a gain of 3.0 or more NCE points.

[b]Met Desired Outcome.

same relative position in terms of the general population. Even a small gain in NCEs indicates an advancement from the pupil's original level of achievement. For readers interested in percentile statistics for Reading Comprehension, see Table A-1 in Appendix A (page 26).

Federal Guidelines Information

Because Federal Guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) and for Total Reading (Basic Skills) for individual buildings, Total Reading test data for grades 2-8 are reported in the following section as aggregated data.

Evaluation of total reading performance. A census of the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Total Reading showed a total of 2082 public and nonpublic school pupils. Of the 1512 pupils in the elementary school (grades 2-5) evaluation sample,1063 were in the primary level and 449 were in the intermediate level. The middle school evaluation sample had a total of 570 pupils.

Overall results for normal curve equivalents for the 2082 pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample for Total Reading are presented in Table 5. Aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available on request. For purposes of this report, only the average NCE scores for Total Reading by grade and total program are reported here. The overall average gain for the program was 5.6 NCEs. Positive changes occurred in all grades: grade 8 had an average gain of 9.0 NCEs; grade 5 had an average gain 7.5 NCEs; grade 3 had an average 7.4 NCE point gain; grade 2 had an average gain of 7.0 NCEs; grade 4 had an average gain of 3.3 NCEs; grade 7 had an average gain of 3.0 NCEs; and grade 6 had an average gain of 1.3 NCEs. For readers interested in percentile statistics, see Table A-2 in Appendix A (page 27).

Basic and advanced skills aggregated scores for federal guidelines. According to Federal Guidelines school buildings will be designated for School Program Improvement in two ways: (1) when any Desired Outcome for the program is not met at the building level, or (2) when the aggregate NCE change score for the building is less than 1.0 NCE in Advanced Skills (Reading Comprehension) and/or Basic Skills (Total Reading). Buildings in School Improvement are required to submit a plan to strengthen their program.

Aggregate scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Assistance, and are available on request. For purposes of this report, only summary data by grade are presented. Aggregate scores were reported earlier in this report for Reading Comprehension (Table 4) and Total Reading (Table 5).

Table 6 presents program pupil performance in Advanced Skills and Basic Skills dichotomized in relation to the federally mandated cut-off point of 1.0 NCE gain. As indicated in Table 6, 1367 pupils (65.1%) made gains of 1.0 or more NCE points in Advanced Skills (Reading Comprehension) and 1372 pupils (65.9%) made gains of 1.0 or more NCE points in Basic Skills (Total Reading). It should be kept in mind that performance at the building level was independent of overall program results.

Desired Outcome 1(b) Information

Desired Outcome 1(b) stated that at least 50 percent of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group will reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. The appropriate Scott Foresman text reading level for the end of grade 1 is successful completion of reading level 8 (3rd preprimer).

Text reading level. To determine a first-grade pupil's (see Footnote 1) text reading level, Nonpublic Project teachers and/or coordinators from Federal and State Programs administered an oral reading test consisting of graded passages from the Scott Foresman basal readers. The pupils had to read each selected graded passage and obtain a mastery score of 90 percent to be successful at a given level. After

Table 5

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) and Overall Average NCE Change for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Total Reading Performance Reported by Grade Level
1991-92

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest				Overall Average NCE Change
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
2	577	1.0	99.0	24.4	14.3	1.0	99.0	31.4	15.7	7.0
3	486	1.0	57.0	24.7	10.0	1.0	70.0	32.1	13.0	7.4
4	243	1.0	66.0	25.7	10.6	1.0	66.0	29.0	11.4	3.3
5	206	1.0	51.0	25.0	10.0	1.0	98.0	32.5	11.8	7.5
6	299	1.0	43.0	24.6	8.9	1.0	53.0	25.9	10.8	1.3
7	183	1.0	38.0	25.3	7.1	1.0	61.0	28.3	10.1	3.0
8	88	1.0	38.0	17.2	8.7	3.0	55.0	26.2	9.3	9.0
Total	2082	1.0	99.0	24.5	11.1	1.0	99.0	30.1	13.1	5.6

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 while grades 3-8 received CTBS as pretest and CAT as posttest. CTBS pretest scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher.

Table 6

Frequencies and Percents of Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) Change Score Categories in Basic Skills and Advanced Skills by Grade in Relation to the State Established Criteria for Program Improvement
1991-92

	NCE Improvement Change Categories									
	Basic Skills[a]					Advanced Skills[b]				
Grade	Pupils in Sample	Less than 1.0		1.0 or More		Pupils in Sample	Less than 1.0		1.0 or More	
		n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%
2*	577	195	33.8	382	66.2	591	150	25.4	441	74.6
3	486	153	31.5	333	68.5	487	147	30.2	340	69.8
4	243	86	35.4	157	64.6	243	133	54.7	110	45.3
5	206	53	25.7	153	74.3	207	75	36.2	132	63.8
6	299	136	45.5	163	54.5	300	154	51.3	146	48.7
7	183	68	37.2	115	62.8	183	52	28.4	131	71.6
8	88	19	21.6	69	78.4	89	22	24.7	67	75.3
Total	2082	710	34.1	1372	65.9	2100	733	34.9	1367	65.1

Note. MAT6 was administered to grade 2 while grades 3-8 received CTBS in the pretest and CAT in the posttest. CTBS pretest scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher.

[a]Basic Skills = Total Reading Subtests

[b]Advanced Skills = Reading Comprehension Subtest

scoring the completed passages, the teacher determined the highest level at which the child read. This level was reported via the telephone to the Department of Program Evaluation. Of the 50 pupils served, 27 first-grade pupils were in the treatment group. Of the 27 pupils, 15 pupils (55.6%) successfully completed level 8. The criteria for Desired Outcome 1(b) were met.

Desired Outcome 2 Information

Desired Outcome 2 stated that 75 percent of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade (grades 1-5) or pass their reading courses (grades 6-8). Information for the public school Chapter 1 Reading Program was collected at the end of the year. To determine the number and percent of pupils who were promoted to the next grade or who passed their reading courses, the district retention file for grade 1-5 pupils and the district grade reporting file for grade 6-8 pupils was used.

Information for the nonpublic school Chapter 1 Reading Program was collected from program teachers via telephone and recorded on the Nonpublic End-of-Year Data Collection Form, a locally developed instrument. Program teachers consulted with each pupil's classroom teacher at the end of the year to determine which pupils (see Footnote 1) were not promoted to the next grade in elementary or failed to pass reading at the middle school level.

Retainee/course failure. Table 7 presents the results of analysis for Desired Outcome 2. Of the 2243 pupils in the treatment group, 2105 (93.8%) were promoted to the next grade or passed their reading courses. In the elementary grades the percent of pupils who were promoted to the next grade ranged from 93.6% in grade 2 to 99.5% in grade 5. In the middle school grades the percent of pupils who passed their reading courses ranged from 86.5% in grade 6 to 92.6% in grade 8. The criterion for measuring Desired Outcome 2 was that 75 percent of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade (elementary pupils) or pass their reading courses (middle school pupils). This criterion was exceeded at every grade level. Thus Desired Outcome 2 was attained.

Desired Outcome 3 Information

Desired Outcome 3 stated that parents of 75 percent of pupils who attended the program 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued would participate in designated Chapter 1 Reading Program activities.

The Pupil Data Sheet (Appendix B, page 31) was used to collect data from teachers at the end of the year concerning program activities involving parents of program children. Parent Involvement data were analyzed in two ways: (1) the number of pupils whose parents had participated in parent involvement, reported only for those pupils who attained the attendance criterion for inclusion in the treatment group for Desired Outcome 3; and (2) overall parent involvement in specific activities, reported for all pupils served during the year.

Parent involvement. Desired Outcome 3 was attained. Parents of 2190 (94.9%) of the 2308 pupils in the treatment group participated in the desired activities. Percent of attainment of criterion in specific grades was as follows: grade 1, (27 of 27 pupils) 100.0% attainment; grade 4, (254 of 263 pupils) 96.6% attainment; grade 2, (627 of 651 pupils) 96.3% attainment; grade 6, (329 of 345 pupils) 95.4% attainment; grade 3, (459 of 488 pupils) 94.1% attainment; grade 5, (209 of 223 pupils) 93.7% attainment; grade 7, (191 of 205 pupils) 93.2% attainment; and grade 8, (94 of 106 pupils) 88.7% attainment. Tables 9 and 10 in the summary section of this report provide an overview of the results of the three Desired Outcomes that were to be achieved by program pupils in the Chapter 1 Reading Program.

Table 7

Total Sample and Number and Percent of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils Who Passed/Failed in Regard to Promotion to Next Grade (Grades 1-5) or Reading/Language Arts Course (Grades 6-8) 1991-92

		Total Group			
	Sample	Passed		Failed	
Grade	N	n	%	n	%
1	27	26	96.3	1	3.7
2	637	596	93.6	41	6.4
3	483	469	97.1	14	2.9
4	259	254	98.1	5	1.9
5	221	220	99.5	1	0.5
6	327	283	86.5	44	13.5
7	194	169	87.1	25	12.9
8	95	88	92.6	7	7.4
Total	2243	2105	93.8	138	6.2

Overall parent involvement. Analysis results of overall parent involvement by activity are presented in Table 8. Individual Conferences accounted for more parent involvement (4392 parents) than any other activity. A total of 2450.3 teacher hours of contact were recorded for Individual Conferences. Yearly totals for the other activities follow: group meeting with parents (1244 parents involved in 1318.7 hours); parent classroom visits (954 parents involved in 535.1 hours); planning, (372 parents involved in 373.5 hours); and visits to parent homes by teacher (148 visits in 250.9 hours of involvement). The total hours for all five types of parent activity was 4928.5. Since a parent could have involvement in more than one activity, an unduplicated count of parents was obtained from program teachers at the end of the year using the Pupil Data Sheet. This count Indicated that a total of 5055 parents of program pupils served were involved in one or more program involvement activities during the school year.

Process Evaluation Information

Two methods were used to collect process evaluation information: auditing of pupils' scheduled/served days and parent involvement records, and on-site visitations.

Audit. Teachers kept a Calendar Worksheet for each pupil to record scheduled/served days and other pupil information. On the reverse side of this instrument was the Parent Involvement Log which was used to record parent involvement information. Teachers were asked to send copies of these records to their Program Evaluator in November 1991, and again, in February 1992. Teachers in public schools were asked to send a random sample (records for every third pupil), while teachers in nonpublic schools were asked to send records for all pupils served. After each teacher's records were reviewed, teachers were scheduled, as needed, for telephone conferences to discuss the findings of the review. During these telephone conferences, any problems were discussed and ameliorated.

On-site visitations. During November and December 1991, Program Evaluators conducted on-site school visitations to all program teachers to verify that the Chapter 1 Consulting Teachers and the Nonpublic Program teachers were using appropriate pupil selection procedures. To facilitate this evaluation activity, the city was divided into geographical areas. Within each geographical area all project teachers in the program were visited by a Program Evaluator--regardless of whether the project units were reading or mathematics, public or nonpublic.

Selection lists were reviewed. The number of pupils served, as well as the number of pupils on the waiting lists in each subject area, were ascertained. Other information obtained from these visitations included the number of pupils who were administered a selection test because they were new to the district or did not have a valid Spring 1991 score, and the number of pupils who were retested in the fall because of classroom teacher recommendation or parent request, even though pupils had already been tested the previous spring. Information was also obtained on the total number of pupils who qualified for the program from a selection test. Overall, most consulting teachers were found to be using appropriate procedures for selecting pupils for their project units.

In April 1992 Program Evaluators made brief drop-by visitations to a limited sample of program teachers. The sample consisted of three Elementary Reading consulting teachers, three Middle School Reading consulting teachers, and two Nonpublic Reading teachers. Two of the consulting teachers (one elementary and one middle school) were combo teachers (teachers who are in both the reading and the mathematics programs). The purpose of these visits was to observe what was occurring relative to the following: an appropriate learning environment, a positive and purposeful classroom climate, and instructional support materials and activities. The observations suggested that teachers were making effective use of available resources in the instruction of program pupils.

Table 8

Number of Parents and Total Number of Hours Reported for Overall Parent Involvement Activities for the Year for the Public and Nonpublic Schools in the Chapter 1 Reading Program
1991-92

	Activity	Number of Parents[a]	Hours
1.	Parents involved in the planning for the unit	372	373.5
2.	Group meetings for parents	1244	1318.7
3.	Individual parent conferences	4392	2450.3
4.	Parental classroom visits or field trips	954	535.1
5.	Visits by teacher to parents' homes	148	250.9
	Total Hours		4928.5

[a]Duplicated count

Summary

The purpose of the Chapter 1 Reading Program was to provide assistance to selected underachieving pupils in grades one through eight in order that they might attain more fully their potential for and improvement of language and reading skills. The program featured small group instruction arranged according to pupil needs, as determined by continued cooperation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Inservice sessions were provided for various subgroups of program teachers.

A total of 5527 pupils was served by the Chapter 1 Reading Program during the 1991-92 school year. Average daily membership in the overall program was 4323.8. The average days scheduled (enrolled) per pupil was 102.3, and the average days served (attended) per pupil was 86.2. Within the Chapter 1 Reading Program were three projects: public elementary (grades 2-5), public middle (grades 6-8), and nonpublic (grades 1-8). The program was staffed with 162 teachers serving 111 public schools, and 11 nonpublic Chapter 1 eligible schools in 170 program units. Of the 5527 pupils served, 3620 pupils were served by 108 teachers in the elementary public school project, 1692 pupils were served by 46 teachers in the public middle school project, and 215 pupils were served by 8 teachers in the nonpublic school project.

Pretest/posttest analyses included two evaluation samples. Norm-referenced test results for Reading Comprehension were reported for grades 2-8 as required in Desired Outcome 1(a). In addition, Federal Guidelines required that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Reading Comprehension and Total Reading for individual buildings. Consequently, Total Reading test data were also reported. Program pupils were included in either or both of the samples. Both evaluation samples were comprised of pupils who met their project attendance criteria, were English speaking, and had a Reading Comprehension and/or a Total Reading pretest and posttest score. Some pupils might have met the criteria for only one evaluation sample.

In regard to aggregate test results to meet Federal Guidelines, aggregate achievement scores for individual buildings were reported to the State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Federal Assistance, and are available upon request. For purposes of this report, only the grade and total program NCE scores were reported. The overall average NCE change for the program was 6.8 in Reading Comprehension and 5.6 in Total Reading. It should be kept in mind that these were aggregate scores for the district. Individual buildings were expected to show an aggregate gain of 1.0 NCE or more according to Federal Guidelines.

The program had three Desired Outcomes. Findings for these Desired Outcomes are summarized in Tables 9 and 10.

The criterion for performance for Desired Outcome 1(a) was that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the sample would gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension. Table 9 gives summary data for pupils in the evaluation sample, with the percent of pupils meeting the criterion for Desired Outcome 1(a). The number of pupils in the evaluation sample for Reading Comprehension shows that of the 2100 pupils in the evaluation sample, 1248 pupils (59.4%) met the criterion for Reading Comprehension.

Desired Outcome 1(b) stated that at least 50% of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group will reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. Of the 50 first grade pupils served, 27 were in the treatment group. Of these pupils, 15 (55.6%) successfully completed the appropriate text reading level.

Table 9

Summary of Total Number of Pupils in Evaluation Samples and Number and Percent of Pupils Meeting Criteria for Desired Outcomes 1(a) and 1(b) for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program 1991-92

	Desired Outcome 1(a) Reading Comprehension			Desired Outcome 1(b) Text Reading Level		
	Sample	Outcome Achieved[a]		Sample	Outcome Achieved[b]	
Grade	N	n	%	N	n	%
1	---	---	---	27	15	55.6
2	591	413	69.9	--	--	--
3	487	316	64.9	--	--	--
4	243	95	39.1	--	--	--
5	207	121	58.5	--	--	--
6	300	125	41.7	--	--	--
7	183	118	64.5	--	--	--
8	89	60	67.4	--	--	--
Total	2100	1248	59.4	27	15	55.6

NOTE. A dash in a cell means the data could not be filled in because the given desired outcome was not applicable for that grade.

[a]The desired outcome for reading comprehension stated that at least 50% of pupils in the grade 2-8 evaluation sample will make a gain of 3.0 or more NCE points.

[b]The desired outcome for text reading level for first-grade pupils in the treatment group stated that pupils will reach an appropriate level (level 8 or higher) for promotion to grade 2.

Table 10

Summary of Total Number of Pupils in Treatment Groups and Number and Percent of Pupils Meeting Criteria for Desired Outcomes 2 and 3 for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program 1991-92

	Desired Outcome 2						Desired Outcome 3		
	Promotion to Next Grade (Elementary)			Pass Reading Course (Middle School)			Parent Involvement		
	Sample	Outcome Achieved[a]		Sample	Outcome Achieved[b]		Sample	Outcome Achieved[c]	
Grade	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%
1	27	26	96.3	--	--	--	27	27	100.0
2	637	596	93.6	--	--	--	651	627	96.3
3	483	469	97.1	--	--	--	488	459	94.1
4	259	254	98.1	--	--	--	263	254	96.6
5	221	220	99.6	--	--	--	223	209	93.7
6	--	--	--	327	283	86.5	345	329	95.4
7	--	--	--	194	169	87.1	205	191	93.2
8	--	--	--	95	88	92.6	106	94	88.7
Total	1627	1565	96.2	616	540	87.7	2308	2190	94.9

[a]The desired outcome for elementary pupils stated that at least 75% of the pupils in the treatment group would be promoted to the next grade. [b]The desired outcome for middle school pupils stated that at least 75% of the pupils in the treatment group would pass the course in which reading instruction occurred. [c]The desired outcome for Parent Involvement stated that the parents of at least 75% of program pupils in treatment group would participate in one or more of the following activities: visiting the classroom, volunteering in the classroom, assisting with homework, reading or being read to by their children, or attending parent-teacher conferences.

Desired Outcome 2 stated that after meeting a certain enrollment and/or attendance criterion 75 percent of pupils in the treatment group would demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom by promotion to the next grade (grades 1-5) or by passing the course in which reading instruction occurs (grades 6-8). The criterion was met in every project at every level with 2105 pupils (93.8%) of the 2243 pupils in the treatment group either being promoted or passing their courses. For results by grade see Table 10.

Desired Outcome 3 stated that parents of at least 75 percent of pupils in the treatment group would participate in designated Chapter 1 Reading Program activities. Teachers reported contact with parents and the hours spent for specified activities. They reported a total of 5055 parents of program pupils involved in one or more activities involving 4928.5 hours. Desired Outcome 3 was attained with parents of 2190 (94.9%) of the 2308 pupils in the treatment group participating in the desired activities. See Table 10 for specific percentages per grade.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor the record-keeping procedures, classroom management, and classroom activities of teachers. Telephone conferences and on-site visitations were instrumental in assuring that program guidelines were being followed.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to strengthen the 1992-93 Chapter 1 Reading Program:

1. Since the program was successful in achieving each of its Desired Outcomes, it is strongly recommended that the program be continued.

2. Of the 5477 pupils served in grades 2-8, only 2100 (38.3%) were included in the evaluation sample for Desired Outcome 1(a) for Reading Comprehension performance. Reasons for the small sample size should be determined and ameliorated if possible.

3. Federal and State Program personnel should continue to provide supervision through inservice and school visitations to maintain the feeling among program teachers of having a strong support system.

4. Administrators and staff should develop a plan to insure that joint planning with program teachers is occurring. Teacher schedules and locations in a building have sometimes acted as constraints to more frequent and formal joint planning.

5. Program teachers need guidance about how to discontinue a pupil. Some teachers still used the word "withdrawn" as a synonymous term for discontinued. Discontinued as defined by Federal and State programs had a specialized meaning which meant essentially that the pupil was at mastery level and no longer needed the program to function in the regular classroom. The definitions of these two words need to be clarified to make sure teachers understand the difference. This confusion was still apparent during this second year of the program.

References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters. (1985). California achievement tests. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters. (1981). Comprehensive tests of basic skills. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

ESEA Chapter 1 FY-92 program application (1991). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Federal and State Programs.

Gibbons, M. (1992, July). Mathematics development component: Chapter 1 mathematics program, 1991-92. Final Evaluation Report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Lore, R. and Chamberlain, E. (1992, March). Language development component: Chapter 1 reading program 1990-91 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1, Final Evaluation Report). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation.

Prescott, G. A., Balow, I. H., Hogan, T. P. and Farr, R. C. (1985). Metropolitan achievement tests, sixth edition. Chicago, Illinois: The Psychological Corporation.

Footnote

[1]One nonpublic school served only pupils with learning disabilities and/or behavior disorders. Because of the special nature of this ungraded nonpublic school, data for standardized achievement testing, retainee/course failure, and text reading level were not collected or reported in the tables or in the discussion of major findings. The only findings reported were from Pupil Census and Parent Involvement data. These data are included in the appropriate tables and discussion.

Appendix A

Additional Tables

Table A-1

Minimum, Maximum, and Median Score of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Reading Comprehension Performance Reported by Grade Level 1991-92

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest			Posttest		
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile
2	591	1	93	11.0	1	99	23.0
3	487	1	70	15.0	1	91	24.0
4	243	1	87	20.0	1	70	21.0
5	207	1	62	17.0	3	96	22.0
6	300	2	46	19.0	1	66	17.0
7	183	1	30	15.0	2	90	21.0
8	89	2	34	4.0	1	54	15.0

Table A-2

Minimum, Maximum, and Median Score of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles for the Public and Nonpublic School Chapter 1 Reading Program in Total Reading Performance Reported by Grade Level 1991-92

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest			Posttest		
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile
2	577	1	99	11.0	1	99	19.0
3	486	1	63	12.0	1	82	20.0
4	243	1	77	11.0	1	77	15.0
5	206	1	51	14.0	1	99	20.5
6	299	1	37	14.0	1	55	15.0
7	183	1	28	13.0	1	70	16.0
8	88	1	28	6.0	1	59	13.0

Appendix B

Instruments

CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE
1991-92

Chapter 1 Reading Programs
Public and Nonpublic
(Grades 2 - 8)

Student Legal Name _____
Last, First

Student Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _
M M D D Y Y

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code _____ (1-5)

Sex _____ (M OR F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level _ _

Service Index Number _ _ . _

Teacher Name _____

Program Code _ _ _ _ _

School _____

School Code _ _ _

1991-92	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	Schdl. (1, 2)	Served (2)
Aug. 26 - Sept. 20	M	M	28	29	30	H	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20		
(Max. schdl. days=05)	0	0				0																
Sept. 23 - Oct. 18	23	24	25	26	27	30	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	COTA		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Oct. 21 - Nov. 15	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	PC		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Nov. 18 - Dec. 13	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	H	N	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13		
(Max. schdl. days=18)									0	0												
Dec. 16 - Jan. 24	16	17	18	19	20	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17	H	21	22	23	24		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																0						
Jan. 27 - Feb. 21	27	28	29	30	31	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	PC	17	18	19	20	21		
(Max. schdl. days=19)															0							
Feb. 24 - Mar. 20	24	25	26	27	28	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 23 - Apr. 17	23	24	25	26	27	30	31	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	N		
(Max. schdl. days=19)											<—Spring Test—>									0		
Apr. 20 - May 15	N	N	N	N	N	27	28	29	30	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15		
(Max. schdl. days=05)	0	0	0	0	0																	
May 18 - June 12	18	19	20	21	22	H	26	27	28	29	1	2	3	4	R	8	9	10	11	12	//////////	//////////
(No scheduled days)						0									0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\

RACE and/or ETHNIC CODES:
1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

SERVICE CODES
0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil present)

ALPHABETIC CODES
(Write Codes to Left of Date—Not in Service Code Field)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn
D = Discontinued

TOTALS	
Schdl.	Served

(Maximum Scheduled = 143)
(Maximum Served = 143)

EVALSRVCS/CHAPTER 1/CTORNT91
08/27/91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: Put the letter x on the line to the left of the name of any pupil you served any time this year in this program. Add pupils as necessary.

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

PUPIL ROSTER TEST 1
SORTED BY NAME WITHIN GRADE

PREPARED BY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT
DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

11:29 Tuesday, February 18, 1992 688

PROGRAM=92004 READING ELEM CHT SCHOOL=645 TREVITT ES SSN [redacted] TEACHER [redacted]

SERVED (X)	LAST	FIRST	MI	STUDENT NUMBER	GR	BIRTH DATE	RACE	SEX
	[redacted]	[redacted]	A	[redacted]	02	022383	1	M
			C		02	022883	2	M
			M		02	031084	1	F
			M		02	062184	2	F
			D		02	062984	1	M
			J		02	013183	1	M
			D		02	020383	2	M
			C		02	072184	2	M
			J		02	090684	1	M
			J		02	021883	2	M
			S		02	020284	2	M
			V		02	081484	2	M
			A		02	011783	1	M
			J		02	032683	1	F
					02	050584	2	M
			Q		02	050783	2	F
			I		02	021284	2	F
			M		02	032284	2	F
			A		02	123082	2	F
			S		02	012484	2	F
			I		02	070684	2	M
			M		02	010683	2	F
			M		02	062584	2	F
			T		02	061582	2	M
			O		02	091883	1	M
			J		02	051984	2	F
			M		02	121983	1	F
			R		02	031582	2	F
			R		02	102284	1	F
			V		02	121084	2	F
			N		02	122484	2	F
			D		02	110584	2	M
			M		02	032283	1	F
			M		02	032683	2	F
			M		02	041784	2	F
			S		02	050384	3	M
			J		02	011284	1	M
			A		02	101383	1	F
			Y		02	110883	1	F
			G		02	012384	2	F
			A		02	061983	2	M
			D		02	110683	1	M
			L		02	050484	1	M

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

April 16, 1992
10:22

SHEET

PUPIL DATA SHEET

104 SCHOOL CODE 312 AVONDALE ES

PROGRAM CODE 92004 READING ELEM CHI

SSN [redacted]

1. STUDENT NAME [redacted] ELSIE I
2. STUDENT NO. [redacted] GRADE 04 BIRTHDATE 01 04 82
3. PUPIL PROGRESS NONE SOME MUCH
4. HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION |___|___|.|___|
5. IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING? NO YES
6. WAS THIS PUPIL DISCONTINUED? NO YES
7. PARENT VOLUNTEERED IN CLASSROOM? NO YES
8. PARENT HELPED WITH HOMEWORK? NO YES
9. PARENT READS TO CHILD OR CHILD READS TO PARENT? NO YES

FOR NUMBERS 10-14, FILL IN THE NUMBER OF THIS PUPIL'S PARENTS INVOLVED IN EACH ACTIVITY DURING THE YEAR AND CUMMULATIVE HOURS OF CONTACT

	NO. OF PARENTS	NO. OF HOURS
10. PLANNING	|___|___|___|___|.|___|
11. GROUP MEETINGS	|___|___|___|___|.|___|
12. INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES	|___|___|___|___|.|___|
13. CLASSROOM VISITS	|___|___|___|___|.|___|
14. HOME VISITS	|___|___|___|___|.|___|

	THRU 04-03-92	FROM 04-06-92 THRU 05-01-92
15. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)	|___|___|___|	|___|___|
16. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)	|___|___|___|	|___|___|

17. ON AVERAGE THIS PUPIL WAS SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE SERVICE

_____ DAYS OUT OF _____.

Prepared by
Office of the Deputy Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

NONPUBLIC END OF YEAR DATA COLLECTION FORM

PROGRAM-92104 SCHOOL-758 ST ANTHONY TEACHER [redacted]

LAST	FIRST	MI	STUDENT NUMBER	GRADE	DATE OF BIRTH	RACE	SEX	TEXT RD. LV.	PROMOTE VALUE (P/F)	FINAL GRADE
[redacted]				01	03-11-85	1	F			
				01	08-04-85	1	F			
				01	02-13-85	1	M			
				01	03-25-85	1	M			
				02	06-02-84	1	M			
				02	07-03-84	2	M			
				02	01-19-84	1	M			
				02	12-12-83	2	M			
				02	05-25-83	1	F			
				03	04-20-82	1	F			
				03	09-26-82	1	M			
				03	12-08-82	1	M			
				04	09-26-81	1	M			
				04	08-27-82	1	M			
				04	07-20-81	1	M			
				04	12-24-81	1	F			
				04	12-13-81	1	F			
				04	10-02-81	1	F			

1. If pupil was not served this year, circle the student number.
2. If Text Reading Level is A or B, enter on LEFT underscore. If it is a numeric value, enter with leading zero.
3. Enter actual grade in Final Grade column.
4. If data is unavailable after call is made, enter a check mark to indicate that caller asked for data.

32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESEA - Chapter 1
Parent Involvement Log
1991-92

Program Code _____ Last Name of Pupil, First _____ Grade _____

Parent Name _____ Address _____ Phone Number _____

THE COLLECTION OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA IS REQUIRED BY CHAPTER 1.

Please check if the following two activities occurred for this pupil anytime this year.

☐ Parent helped child with homework

☐ Parent read to child or child read to parent

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate in the fields below the activity, name of parent/guardian, and the hours they were involved in the Chapter 1 program. ROUND HOURS TO THE NEAREST TENTH. Obviously, you may keep expanded notes about activities somewhere else.

Date MMDDYY	Activity* (1-5)	Attendee(s). Parent/Guardian	Hours 00.0
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___
_____	_____	_____	___.___

*Kinds of Parent Involvement to record for the column labeled Activity

(1) Involved in planning (do not include advisory council)
(2) Group meetings (do not include advisory council)
(3) Individual conferences (telephone conferences included)
(4) Parental classroom visits
(5) Home visits

P:\P502\FRPTRD92
2-17-93 7:33 AM

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1991-92

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/92)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____ a.m. _____p.m. _____ after school

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Nonpublic (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) Early Literacy (2)

Other (Specify)

(14) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

P:\P502\FRPTRD92
7-8-93 12:51 PM

ESEA CHAPTER 1, CHAPTER 2, AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1991-92 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting _____ A.M.___ P.M.___

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Nonpublic (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) Early Literacy (2)

Other (Specify)
(14) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2 The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

Please turn over for questions 6-9

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings? _____

_____